REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Office Action are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Initially, it is noted that Birrell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,805,803), which is discussed in the Office Action, was not listed on the PTO-892 Form that was attached to the Office Action. Therefore, it is requested that Birrell et al. be cited on a PTO-892 Form included with the next Office Action.

Claims 1-22 are pending, with Claims 1, 7, 13, 18, 22, and 25 being independent. Claim 25 has been amended. Support for the amendment can be found throughout originally filed disclosure. Therefore, it is submitted that no new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 16, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Birrell et al. Claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 11, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatenable over Birrell et al.

The rejections are respectfully traversed. It is submitted that the rejected claims recite features not taught or suggested by Birrell et al., as set forth below.

The Office Action alleges Birrell et al. discloses all of the features recited in Claims 1, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 16, and 25. The Office Action also takes Official Notice that the features recited in Claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 11, and 15, while not disclosed in Birrell et al., are well know in the art, and, thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Birrell et al. so as to include these features.

It is submitted, however, that Birrell et al. does not disclose or suggest a method for facilitating the sharing of data between a first domain and second domain with the

combination of features recited in independent Claim 1. For example, Claim 1 recites access to a resource includes authorization by a first domain, and a secure token is originated with the first domain. Also according to Claim 1, the secure token is set in a cookie by a second domain, and a request for the resource from a user system is to the second domain is recieved. Birrell et al., on the other hand, is devoid of any explicit reference to "domains." Applicants, therefore, have difficulty understanding what features of Birrell et al. are being equated by the Office to "domains," as the term is used in the claims of the present application. Accordingly, if the rejection in view of Birrell et al. is maintained, Applicants request clarification as to how the disclosure of Birrell et al. is seen as anticipating "domains," as well as other features, recited in the claims of the present application.

It appears that the only elements of Birrell et al. that could even possibly be equated to "domains" are the redirector 142, proxy 143, and checker 141. Assuming, *arguendo*, that these elements can be equated to "domains," Birrell et al. does not teach or suggest functions in conjunction with these elements like the functions in conjunction with the first and second domains recited in Claim 1. For example, Birrell et al. does not disclose or suggest both access to a resource including authorization by the redirector 142 or the proxy 143, and a secure token being originated by the redirector 142 or the proxy 143. See, e.g., Birrell et al., Fig. 3. Thus, Birrell et al. does not teach or suggest all of the functioning in conjunction with the redirector 142 or the proxy 143, as is recited in conjunction with the first domain of Claim 1. Further, Birrell et al. does not disclose or suggest setting a cookie on a user system by the redirector 142 or the proxy 143. *Id.* Thus, Birrell et al. does not teach or suggest functions in conjunction with the redirector 142 or the proxy 143 like

those recited in conjunction with the second domain of Claim 1. Still further, <u>Birrell et al.</u> does not authorize access to a resource by checker 141, or receive a request for a resource from a user system to the checker 141. *Id.* Therefore, <u>Birrell et al.</u> does not teach or suggest functions in conjunction with checker 141 like the functions in conjunction with the first and second domains recited in Claim 1.

In sum, neither redirector 142, proxy 143, nor checker 141 of <u>Birrell et al.</u> are associated with all of the corresponding functions of either the first domain or second domain recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, <u>Birrell et al.</u> cannot be understood to teach or suggest a method as recited in Claim 1.

Independent Claim 7 recites a computer system that also includes first and second domains. Similar to the case with respect to Claim 1, it is submitted that the redirector 142, proxy 143, and checker 141 of <u>Birrell et al.</u> do not include all of the features of the modules in relation to the first and second domains recited in Claim 7. For example, none of the redirector 142, proxy 143, and checker 141 both authorizes access to a resource and originates a secure token, like the first domain recited in Claim 7. *Id.* Further, neither of the redirector 142, proxy 143, nor checker 141 both sets at least one secure token in a cookie on a user system and receives a request for a resource like the second domain recited in Claim 7. *Id.* Thus, the redirector 142, proxy 143, and checker 141 of <u>Birrell et al.</u> cannot be understood to include all of the features of the modules in relation to the first and second domains as recited in Claim 7.

Independent Claim 13 recites a method for facilitating the sharing of data between a first and second domain. As with Claim 1 discussed above, it is submitted that the redirector 142, proxy 143, and checker 141 of <u>Birrell et al.</u> cannot be understood to equate

the functions involving the first domain, as recited in Claim 13. For example, none of the redirector 142, proxy 143, and checker 141 authorizes access to a resource, sets at least one user token, and includes a secure token in a response, as is recited in conjunction with the first domain recited in Claim 13. *Id.* Thus, the redirector 142, proxy 143, and checker 141 cannot be understood to anticipate or suggest the features relating to a first domain, as recited in independent Claim 13.

Independent Claim 25 recites a method for facilitating the sharing of data between a first domain and second domain. As in the case of Claims 1 and 13 discussed above, it is submitted that the redirector 142, proxy 143, and checker 141 of Birrell et al. cannot be understood to be associated with all of the functions involving domains as is recited in Claim 25. For example, none of these elements of Birrell et al. both requests authentication of a user session and sets a secure token in a cookie, as is related to second domain recited in Claim 25. *Id.* Thus, Birrell et al. cannot be understood to teach or suggest a method as recited in this claim.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that independent Claims 1, 7, 13, and 25 recite features not taught or suggested by Birrell et al.

Dependent Claims 2-6, 8-12, and 14-17 recite features of the present invention in addition to those recited in the independent claims from which they depend. Further individual consideration of the dependent claims is requested.

Additionally with respect to the dependent claims, the Official Notice taken in the Office Action that these features are well known in the art is respectfully traversed. It is requested that the Office provide documentary evidence in support of the Official Notice. See MPEP § 2144.03. In any event, it is noted that the Official Notice taken in the Office

Action is not with respect to the features noted-above that are lacking in <u>Birrell et al.</u> As such, it is submitted that the combination of <u>Birrell et al.</u> and the Official Notice taken in the Office Action does not render the claims obvious, and, thus, cannot form a basis for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) against the claims.

The Examiner's indication in the Office Action that Claims 18-24 are allowed is noted with appreciation. The Examiner's indication that dependent Claims 4, 10, 14, and 17 recite allowable subject matter is also noted with appreciation. As described above, however, the independent claims from which Claims 4, 10, 14, and 17 depend are themselves allowable over the cited reference to <u>Birrell et al.</u> Accordingly, these dependent claims have not been rewritten into independent form at this time.

It is submitted the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 set forth in the Office Action, and a Notice of Allowability are requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr./

Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 60,081

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
DHH/klm

FCHS_WS 1666294v1